THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

W.P.No.454 of 2006

Date:06.01.2006

Between:

Dr.G.Madhavi w/o.G.Krishna Reddy,

37 yrs., Lecturer in Chemistry

B.T.College, Madanapalli, Chittor district. … petitioner.

And

1. The Govt.of A.P., rep by

Commissioner and Director of Technical Education ,

BRKR Bhavan, Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad.

2. The K.S.R.M.College of Engienering,Kadapa.

3. The K.S.R.M.college of Engienering, Kadapa. … respondents.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

W.P.No.454 of 2006

ORDER:

The petitioner challenges the order dated 9.12.2005 passed by the Correspondent of K.S.R.M.College of Engineering, Kadapa.

The petitioner was appointed as Assistant Lecturer in the second respondent college initially between 4.12.1992 and 16.6.1993 on a consolidated salary of Rs.1,800/- per month. The petitioner continued thereafter for some more time. Some disputes arose as regards payment of salary to the petitioner. On an earlier occasion, the petitioner approached this Court by filing W.P.no.17550 of 1998. The said writ petition was disposed of leaving it open to the petitioner to make a representation and the second respondent in turn was directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders. It was in this context that the Director of Technical Education, the first respondent also addressed letter dated 5.12.2005 to the second respondent with a request to finalize the issue relating to the payment of arrears to the petitioner. The impugned order came to be passed in this context.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Technical Education.

Though the petitioner had made extensive submissions touching the merits of the matter, this Court is not inclined to deal with the same. It is not in dispute that the second respondent is a private unaided educational institution. It is not amenable to have jurisdiction in the matter of its relations with the employees. The petitioner does not complain of infraction of any statutory provisions. The dispute relates to payment of arrears of salary. Even to ascertain this, recording of evidence is necessary. The question of limitation would also become relevant. It is only in suits filed before the Civil Courts that such questions can be decided effectively.

Hence, the writ petition is dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to workout her remedies by instituting proceedings in accordance with the relevant provisions of law.

_____

06.01.2006.

mdaa.